

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-8 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner argues that the term "each terminal" lacks antecedent basis. The claims have been appropriately amended.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chiu and Chomette et al. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are now patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below. Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

... wherein each of said loudspeakers covers most of a distance extending from edge to edge of said printed circuit board ...

Applicants' exemplary embodiment includes a plurality of speakers 23 mounted on printed circuit board 22. As shown in Fig. 1, the printed circuit board 22 has a length greater than a width. The width of the printed circuit board 22 extends from edge to edge. Each of said speakers 23 covers a distance that is most of a distance extending from edge to edge. That is, there is a physical relationship between the printed circuit board 22 and the speakers 23 mounted on the printed circuit board 22. This physical relationship is defined by "...each of said loudspeakers covers most of a distance extending from edge to edge of said printed circuit board," as recited in claim 1.

The Official Action argues that Fig. 6 of Chiu discloses a printed circuit board having a length greater than a width and a plurality of speakers connected to the printed circuit board in a substantially straight configuration. (Office Action, page 3, lines 8-9). The Official Action also argues that Fig. 7 of Chiu discloses "... each of said loudspeakers covers most of a distance extending from edge to edge of said printed circuit board." (Office Action, page 3, lines 18-20). Applicants respectfully disagree. Figs. 6 and 7 of Chiu are **schematic diagrams** (circuit diagrams) for electrically connecting speakers SP1-SP6. (Paras. [0024]-[0025]) specifically use the term

Application No.: 10/535,569
Amendment Dated: January 28, 2008
Reply to Office Action of: November 26, 2007

MAT-8672US


"schematic." These schematic diagrams shown in Figs. 6 and 7 do not show a **physical relationship** between the speakers and the printed circuit board. Thus, Chiu does not disclose "... each of said loudspeakers covers most of a distance extending from edge to edge of said printed circuit board," as recited in claim 1.

Chomette et al. discloses a printed circuit board 2 for carrying electronic circuits 3 and supply cells 4. Chomette et al. also discloses a piezoelectric element 11 that is adjacent to printed circuit board 2 and connected by wires 6. Chomette et al. does not, however, disclose "...each of said loudspeakers covers most of a distance extending from edge to edge of said printed circuit board," as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2 is also allowable over the art of record.

Claims 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chiu, Chomette et al. and Applicants' admitted prior art. Claims 3-8 are allowable, however, because they depend from allowable claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

DFD/dfd/fp

Dated: January 28, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

DMW/225754